



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

*JULY.*

*1898*

ANNALS  
OF THE  
AMERICAN ACADEMY  
OF  
POLITICAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCE.

---

THE STUDY AND TEACHING OF SOCIOLOGY.

THE ANNUAL MEETING OF 1898.

The members of the American Academy of Political and Social Science are so widely scattered geographically that the Committee on Meetings decided early in 1897 to hold an annual meeting made up of several sessions on consecutive days. Such a meeting it was hoped would prove a sufficient attraction to bring members from a distance who would not feel justified in coming to Philadelphia for a single session. Just as in the beginning several papers on topics without any necessary relation to each other were presented at the ordinary sessions, though later it was found expedient to limit the discussions at any one session to a single topic, so at the first annual meeting, held in April, 1897, there were four sessions each with a distinct topic. In planning for the annual meeting of 1898 the committee adopted a policy which departed somewhat radically from the usual procedure at annual gatherings and conventions. It was decided to have one general topic for all the sessions, with closely related sub-topics for the several separate sessions. We believed that whatever our program might lose in general attractiveness and drawing power in respect to numbers, it

would more than gain in effectiveness and in permanent scientific value.

Of course for the first experiment in this line it was necessary to select as broad a topic as possible. In view of the fact that the International Institute of Sociology at its third congress held in Paris in July, 1897, had devoted the major part of its time to a discussion of the scope and method of sociology, it was proposed to present the results of American thought and experience along the same lines as those brought out at Paris, but arranged particularly with a view to supplementing that discussion. The topic chosen therefore was: "The Study and Teaching of Sociology."

#### I. THE PRACTICAL VALUE OF SOCIOLOGY.

Professor Franklin H. Giddings, of Columbia University, the foremost representative of sociology as a specialty in the American academic world and one of the vice-presidents of the Academy, was invited by the Committee on Meetings to deliver the annual address at the opening session held on the evening of April 11.

Dr. Giddings chose for his topic a question which lies at the root of all the discussion in America, both inside and out of academic circles, concerning the status of sociology, namely, "The Practical Value of Sociology." Much of the opposition to this new science, especially that which is represented by some of the great American daily papers, is of course inspired by the feeling that sociological investigation may lead to discoveries inimical to existing and vested rights in property and to established customs in our political, educational and religious life. While this constitutes the real reason why the representatives of vested rights view with some apprehension the growing interest in sociological research, curiously enough the greatest popular demand for such work has come, not from the extreme radicals, but from many very conservative quarters, especially from those engaged in social reform of various kinds with a view to

improving and making tolerable the present social régime. This combination of circumstances has very generally raised the question as to the practical results to be obtained from the study of sociological literature.

Dr. Giddings began his address with a reference to the paper which Dr. Ernst Mach read at the Vienna meeting in 1894 of the German Association of Naturalists and Physicians, in which he recalled the definition of mechanics given by Kirchhoff twenty years previously. This definition which said that mechanics is "the description, in complete and very simple terms, of the motions occurring in nature," created general astonishment in scientific circles, because no reference was made in a definition of the most exact and most advanced science to explanation, prediction and to the search for first principles or causes as the criteria of science. Dr. Giddings commented on the meaning of scientific description as used by Kirchhoff and maintained that explanation, prediction and formulation of laws are nothing more nor less than that description which puts together facts in a coherent system or continuum which accurately corresponds to the coherent system or continuum of reality.

Again, referring to Mach and Kirchhoff, it was stated that the object of science is to extend description, in the scientific sense of the word, "until it includes all knowable facts of matter, life, mind and society, and places each fact in its proper place in the complete system."

Continuing, Dr. Giddings says:

"This conception of science—the only one which a critical examination of the nature of our knowledge permits us to entertain, clearly reveals the exact practical value of science. As science approaches perfection, the description of the cosmos becomes continuous. We discover that every known fact has points of contact, in co-existence and in sequence, with other known facts. The lines and colors in our chart of the universe are not drawn or splashed at random; they lie before the mental vision in a marvelous order of gradations, proportions, series and systems. All the facts in any part of our chart are seen to be related to all facts in every other part."

"So we arrive at the conception of nature as a system of interdependent facts. This conception once reached, we perceive exactly what we mean when we say that science enables us to predict combinations of facts not hitherto observed. Convinced by what we already know, that our further description of nature will not derange the system already apparent in our chart, we expect that further knowledge will merely continue the curves already partly drawn, without changing their equations, fill in unknown terms of series without changing their formulæ, and supply shades of color that will not disturb the scheme already apparent. Science thus enables us to anticipate facts not yet actually observed. If, then, we admit that science is description and that description both reveals and presupposes the interdependence of the descriptive elements, we can accept the theoretical and practical conclusion at which Dr. Mach arrives, that science completes in thought facts that are only partly given.

"This conclusion, I affirm, is no less practical than theoretical, because if such is the nature and function of science, science enables us to accommodate our conduct or policy to combinations of facts not yet completely made, but which science assures us will, in the course of time, be made—at least approximately—in the world of reality. The more nearly perfect our description of any part of that world becomes, the more closely may we adapt our plans, not only to the things that now are, but to the things that shall be hereafter."

If the word "description" can properly characterize so advanced a science as mechanical physics, Dr. Giddings maintains that it is broad enough to characterize the comparatively new and as yet very imperfect science of sociology.

"To make our description of human society more accurate, more coherent, is a task grand enough to awaken the enthusiasm and inspire the labor of any man who has enough of the scientific spirit to justify a career of sociological investigation;" and a sufficient definition of sociology is that it is "a scientific description of society."

It would seem from the above account that Dr. Giddings is willing boldly to claim that sociology is a fundamental and general science of associated life and activity, which is to be justified by its practical results measured by its successes in detecting and discovering facts hitherto overlooked or neglected by the more special social sciences. It may be noted, however, that the view here put forth makes

definite provision for the use of both the deductive and inductive methods of research.

In the next place, Dr. Giddings discussed some of the descriptive elements of sociology and their practical value for the determination of private conduct and public policy, and in this connection discussed the question, what is society? and what does it stand for in our every day use of the term? The answer to this question furnishes the starting point for descriptive analysis.

“Nearly two thousand years ago, one of the most gifted men of any age found himself under the immediate necessity of trying, for a great practical purpose, to single out and force upon the attention of mankind the most essential, persistent and formative fact of human society. That man was the Apostle Paul. He had been converted to a new religion; and had become its chief interpreter and missionary. Accepting the duty which circumstances and his own nature placed before him, of attempting to spread and organize the new faith throughout the known world, he was compelled to examine with the utmost care the question of the social form in which this new interest should be incorporated. All of the older religions against which Christianity was to make headway had grown into elaborate social systems, with their priesthoods, their carefully graded ranks or classes of believers, their rituals and festivals. Against their formalism Christianity protested. Its own social principle, like its individual principle, must be inward and spiritual, rather than external and legal. We may well believe that during those three years which the Apostle spent in retirement in Arabia, working out the details of his system, he gave most serious thought to this social aspect of his problem. It was necessary for him to find a psychological fact or principle of social organization which should be also universal, as true for the Roman as for the Jew, for the Barbarian as for the Greek; so simple that the bondman no less than the free could grasp it, yet so rich in possibilities that the philosophical disputants of Mars Hill and the practical lawyers on the Capitoline might be expected to accept and develop it. What, then, was the social fact that this subtle thinker and eminently practical man under such circumstances, fixed upon as essential and all-comprehensive?

“It was the fact of like-mindedness. Over and over in his Epistles he forces this fact upon the attention of his readers, and warns them to give heed to it. ‘Be of the same mind one towards another,’ he says to the Romans; and in the same Epistle he prays for them that

they may be of the same mind; that with one accord and with one mouth they may glorify their God. The Corinthians he beseeches to 'speak the same thing;' to 'have no divisions' among them; that they may be 'perfected together in the same mind and in the same judgment.' And the Philippians he implores to 'stand fast in one spirit, with one soul;' to 'be of the same mind, having the same love, being of one accord.' That it was in truth Paul who first seized upon this social principle for practical purposes, we have positive proof. Only in two other places, outside of the writings of Paul, can any allusion to it be found in either the Old or the New Testament. One is in the first Epistle of Peter, where the expression 'finally, be ye all like-minded' is so exactly the phraseology of Paul that we can hardly doubt that it was borrowed from him. The other is in Revelations where ten kings are spoken of as having one mind. That Paul himself derived the suggestion from the Greeks is highly probable, since Aristotle, in the 'Ethics,' quotes the saying that 'birds of a feather flock together,' and recalls a contention of Empedocles that 'like desires like.' But so far as we know, neither Greek nor Jew before Paul ever singled out this principle as the all-essential fact to be remembered in the development of any plan of social organization.

"Was Paul right in his selection of the essential social fact? Speaking only for myself, and leaving other investigators of society to form their own conclusions from all available evidence, I must say that after many years of persistent thought upon this question, I am fully persuaded that he was absolutely and profoundly right. If this is true, we have at once our provisional definition of society—the conception from which we go forward to a more complete description. The like-mindedness upon which Paul insists is known and understood to be such by the individuals who share it. Not only do A and B agree in their thoughts, feelings, purposes; but both A and B are aware of their agreement. Moreover, they perceive that agreement is pleasurable; that the fruits of concord are happiness and peace; that discord is wretchedness, and is liable to end in misery and disunion. They strive, as Paul enjoins them, to be without divisions, and to be perfected together in the same mind and the same judgment. What then is a society? Obviously, it is any number of like-minded individuals, who know and enjoy their like-mindedness, and are therefore able to work together for common ends."

Even the societies, which seem to have a physical rather than a psychological basis of existence, such as villages, cities and nations, are still natural aggregations of people which have developed a social organization because of like-

mindfulness. This is the essence of a political system. The practical value of this first step in the scientific description of society is, then, said to be a scientific justification of "that instinct of mankind which opposes a rapid influx of alien elements into any existing population which is fairly homogeneous, and which resists all heresy, schism, and dissension when carried beyond a certain point." This scientific description of society, however, must also give an account of variation. Like-mindedness is the cause of all social stability, and unlike-mindedness the cause of social variation. Changes for better or for worse depend on the introduction of new types of character, new ways of thinking, new habits and new ambitions.

"Progress, in short, is the continuous harmonizing of a continually appearing unlikeness of feeling, thought and purpose in the community with a vast central mass of already established agreements. Thus we arrive at the second practical value of sociology. It enables us to see that while a fundamental harmony of beliefs and interests must, if possible, be maintained in any social population or artificial social organization; and while it may, at times, be necessary to check a too rapid inflow of alien elements; or a too radical development of dissenting opinions, in themselves immigration and dissent are necessary and good, and are to be welcomed just to the extent that they can be assimilated. Their function is to leaven the lump, not to explode it."

In the next place, the annual address discussed the methods of social change. It was stated that a great deal of social progress goes on as quietly and unconsciously as the growth of a forest.

"Slight differences of nationality are assimilated; minor peculiarities of manner are imitated; modifications of opinion are effected until, in the course of time, a really important metamorphosis of society has taken place, and no one can tell exactly how."

Other changes, however, like the Puritan rebellion in England, the American revolution of 1776, the ratification of the federal constitution, the abolition of negro slavery, and the establishment of the French republic, come only as



a result of the voluntary and combined action of great masses of men. Such rapid transformations are due either to impulsive, unreasoning social action, of which the mob is an illustration, or to deliberation and discussion.

"Sociology, by its more accurate description of the conditions and processes of mob action, can add nothing to the repugnance which all calm-minded men feel toward such outbreaks of the brute nature that still survives in man. Nevertheless, the sociological description of the mob contributes two new elements of great practical value to our knowledge of this subject. The first is a demonstration that in all cases of impulsive outbreak the transition from violent talk to violent action is first made by the irrepressible quasi-criminal elements of the population. Riots, insurrections, revolutions, rarely begin with the striking of a well-directed blow by a disciplined force, under the command of a far-seeing and cool-headed leader. They begin with assaults, thefts and homicides, with volleys of stones, with random shootings and stabbings, with the looting of shops, and the lynching of opponents. History teems with examples. . . . The absolute impossibility of checking, until it has run its course, any mob action that has once fairly begun, has now been fairly established as a demonstrated sociological principle; and this is the second element which an accurate scientific description of society adds to our knowledge of the non-reasoning or impulsive modes of social transformation. From the moment that reason finally loses its control over masses of communicating men they instantly fall under the power of imitation and hypnotic suggestion; and emotional fury sweeps through them with increasing volume and accelerating velocity, as a conflagration sweeps through accumulations of combustible material. Impulsive social action, in short, proceeds not slowly through the mass, as water filters through sand, but with the frightful acceleration of a geometrical progression. This law has been fully established by psychological and sociological research, and it is no more open to doubt than is the law of gravitation. No fact of social knowledge is of greater practical importance. The only way to prevent the devastating consequences of epidemic madness is to multiply in the community the number of those men who habitually subordinate feeling to reason, and who, therefore, cannot become a part of the combustible material of the mob spirit. . . .

"Under what conditions are irrationality, hypnotic susceptibility, willingness to follow without question or resistance any suggested course of action most likely to prevail in the community? Are we maintaining educational influences or agencies whose certain

tendency is to multiply the number of unreasoning, impulsive members of society? When our question is put in this way I cannot doubt that you will immediately foresee the answer that must be made. In the name of religion, society for generations has cherished a dangerous influence, and has encouraged the practice of arts that menace the happiness and the further progress of mankind. Of all mistaken teachers in the community the professional revivalist is most to be feared. The revival meeting is, and always has been, the chief school of impulsive action. Throughout human history the revival has been the foster mother of the mob. . . . The methods of the professional revivalist are those of the professional hypnotizer. The only difference is that they are somewhat more refined, and keep their machinery a little more out of sight. The revivalist tells his hearers that their reason is the most deadly enemy of their souls; that the deliberating, critical habit of mind endangers their eternal salvation; that their only safety lies in immediately acting upon the impulse which he is striving to awaken in their bosoms. . . . Do you expect that men and women who surrender themselves to the influence of such teaching in the revival meeting will act coolly, reasonably and courageously in the affairs of secular life? Do you suppose that those who yield unresistingly to the impassioned appeal of the exhorter will be unmoved by the harangue of the partisan 'whoop-er-up,' or resist the impulse to follow blindly the lead of the boss who, like his religious preceptor, exacts unquestioning obedience, and visits condign punishment upon the skeptic? Certainly you do not; and the longer you think this matter over the more fully satisfied will you become of the truth of this conclusion which, I venture to assert, is one of the fundamental truths of a scientific description of society: that so long as revivalism is possible the overthrow of Plattism, Crokerism and Quayism will be impossible. Let us not deceive ourselves with the belief that we can make men irrational, impulsive, hypnotic creatures for the purposes of religion, and then expect them to be cool-headed, critical, rational men for the purposes of politics."

Dr. Giddings went on to say that the chief element in social control in communities where reason and deliberation flourish, is the criticism of social values, understanding the term "social value" to be the regard or esteem which we feel for any social habit, relation or institution, measured as to intensity by the sacrifices which we are willing to make for it. Thus, social values like economic values, "are determined by a process of comparison extended

throughout the entire range of possible utilities and costs." Sociology reveals two great orders of social values, namely, those that are ends to be attained and those that are simply means to the attainment of ends, a distinction analogous to economic categories in which goods are either for final consumption or used in production and described as capital.

"The objects of all endeavor, whether of individuals or of communities, are life, happiness and the development of our rational personality. Society itself is simply a means to those ends. . . . It should be one of the chief functions of the teacher of sociology to repeat and to insist until mankind does see and admit that customs, usages, institutions, parties, churches, creeds, have no sacredness in themselves, and no other warrant for their existence than may be found in their power to contribute, either to the safe and comfortable maintenance of human life, or to the further progress of the human mind in knowledge, power, reasonableness and moral perfection."

In the concluding portion of the annual address, Dr. Giddings maintained that the scientific description of society not only reveals the relativity of all our social arrangements, but gives a rough estimate of the comparative importance of means and ends. "I mean to affirm that all social institutions are related in a definite way to the fundamental social fact of like-mindedness; and that all criticism of social values must proceed with due reference to this condition." In illustrating this point, three popular and much discussed social values embodied in the phrase "liberty, equality and fraternity" were described. Reference was made to the position of Sir James Fitz-James Stephen who claimed that these three values are fundamentally irreconcilable, and that if equalities are maintained liberties must be sacrificed. Dr. Giddings said, "Actually, there have been innumerable small democracies here and there, and innumerable religious societies and fraternal organizations in which all three of these democratic ideals have, at the same time, been fairly well realized." Of course the terms were discussed as relative terms, and all that is meant is that approximation to equality and to liberty is sufficiently great to outweigh the

inequalities and restraints. It was further noted that those communities and social organizations which fairly well maintained both equality and liberty and reconciled them with a good degree of fraternity, were generally noted for their homogeneity; while those which have sacrificed either equality or liberty have been in a high degree heterogeneous. Thus, modern cities, like New York and Philadelphia, "have completely lost that approximate balance of liberty and equality which they originally maintained, and present to our view an astonishing medley of specific liberties and specific equalities, offset by inequalities and restrictions that our forefathers would have deemed inconceivable." The possible co-existence of these three ideals depends largely on their sequence, which the speaker maintained had always been equality, fraternity, liberty.

"Only as a certain degree of equality is maintained can there be homogeneity or like-mindedness. Nothing will so surely bring about an irreconcilable conflict of feeling and opinion as a great inequality of economic condition, of political status, or of educational opportunity. All of the great social conflicts of history have originated in inequality. . . . Just to the extent that there develops in the community an ethical spirit which leads us to resist the monopolization by the few of resources and opportunities that should be the common heritage of all mankind, to demand that our public school system of education shall be perfected, and that our laws shall be equally enforced, our nation may become republican in fact as in name and tradition."

In conclusion the speaker said: "I have now indicated many of the practical values of sociology. The list is by no means complete. I have only selected those chiefly important ones which are more immediately connected with the chiefly important propositions of sociological theory. Sociology enables us to govern, in a measure, the conditions on which social stability and social progress depend. It enables us to appreciate the profound distinction between impulsive and rational social change, and to discover the dangers that lurk in the practice of attaching the sanctions of religion to irrationality. In addition to all these services, sociology enables us to attempt a rational and constructive criticism of our social values, and to combine them in a realizable social ideal. It extends its scientific description of society into the past, and projects it into the future. Its forecast is no

impossible Utopia. It assumes that if the work of description is accurately done in the present, the sociologist of the future will have no occasion to substitute for it a wholly new system of facts; but will only complete the system already begun. In a word, the supreme practical value of sociology is that it, like every other science, completes in thought, for the daily guidance of mankind, a system of facts that, as yet, are only partly given."

The following is a brief summary of the discussion on the annual address, an opportunity being given for this purpose on the following day, April 12, at the morning session.

Professor LEO S. ROWE ( University of Pennsylvania):—

"There are two questions of principle and one of fact, concerning which I am not perfectly certain whether I grasp the meaning which Professor Giddings intended to convey. In his analysis of the logic of social progress, my impression was that Professor Giddings regards concerted action resulting from impulse or feeling as essentially retrogressive in its influence upon the social or political conditions of the community, and that the kind of political action which will be progressive has its foundation in that conscious deliberation, that careful weighing of pleasures and pains, of cause and effect, of which he gave a number of instances. The first question that arises in my mind is whether the speaker intended to convey the idea that action resulting from feeling is the same thing as action resulting from impulse. The second question relates to his analysis of the fact that, in our American communities, we find certain influences—of which he gave a specific instance in boss rule—largely forming and influencing our present political conditions. As I understood the speaker, the explanation of many of our political evils is to be found in the dominance of unreasoning action in our community. One of the reasons for boss rule is the fact that large classes in the community find it to be to their personal gain or profit to act in subservience to boss rule, and this is the idea which is usually accepted. Is it Professor Giddings' idea that the boss represents a kind of ideal personality to the average individual and that he is willing to throw his lot with that particular individual who represents a force rather than with a person representing principles that appeal to his reason? My third question is a question of fact. That is, whether this increased like-mindedness, to which the speaker referred, is at the bottom of many of our political ideals and whether it offers the possibility for the realization of political ideals. Is this like-mindedness anything more than a state of mind which is determined by other considerations?

France at the present day while homogeneous has in no sense realized political liberty. But the forces which have been at work in France, where you have great like-mindedness, are to be explained mainly on the basis of certain peculiarities in French national character, which are the result of French historical development."

Professor GIDDINGS :—

"I think the first two questions can be answered together and in the same way, if I understand Professor Rowe's inquiry. I do not hold that all progressive action necessarily follows from a weighing and calculation of pleasures and pains, of costs and utilities. I hold that the greater part of all progressive action proceeds from feeling. But, we may have any one of three states of mind in a man who is confronted with a new situation. He may receive a sudden stimulus and instantly react upon it by almost reflex action, not stopping at all to weigh and consider or criticise. He may receive the same shock, the same impulse and feel himself moved to act, but may pull himself together, study, criticise, think it over, and then perhaps act or not. Or, he may find himself confronted by a situation that does not move him to sudden purpose in the same way, but that calls upon him to reason, to weigh and consider, to calculate pleasures and pains. Now, the first and the last of these cases stand opposed to one another. In the first you have the man whose action is hardly more than reflex; in the last you have the man who is a cold-blooded utilitarian. The average man is the man who is moved, a great deal moved by the new situation that confronts him, whose first impulse is to act at once but who stops and considers. The actions that I discussed in my paper were these: Take the case of this second man, who is moved to act impulsively but who stops and thinks. You get two kinds of action out of this one situation, and from this average man under different circumstances. In the one case he leans strongly toward his first impulse, he forgets to criticise, he does not go on to weigh and consider, but acts impulsively. In the other case he still has the same impulse, but he does stop to weigh and consider. My point is, that most of the constructive changes in society are due to the actions of those who have a thinking, a critical habit of mind; those who stop to consider, to weigh, and to think things over. Sweep away this habit and you have the mob. The practical lesson is: Keep these habits of criticism well with you. When you have the impulse to reform and change things, be critical, be rational, be reasonable, then let your impulses act themselves out. This is my reply to the first and second questions.

"If I understand the third question I agree with Professor Rowe in his statement that like-mindedness is a particular state of mind and

that to make it potential you must have some outside forces to act upon it. In other words, you have like-mindedness when you have two persons or more who feel in the same way about a given thing; whose impulse is to act in the same way upon a given situation, or, who if they think it over, come to the same opinion about it. Now, that thing that they feel in the same way about may be anything at all. The thing upon which they agree, upon which they are like-minded, may be a common opinion that they like boss government. They may be the sort of people who, as has been said of the people of France, like centralization, and who do not care anything for individual liberty. Or, they may be the people of another nation who are agreed and who are like-minded in their love of individual liberty and in their impulse to defend it at any moment and at any price. In other words, you have like-mindedness when you have that likeness among any people which makes it practically certain that under the same circumstances they will act in the same way. That agreement may be, as I say, upon any subject. The like-mindedness may exist in any particular mental state; it may be in love of restraint, or it may be in love of liberty.

President CHARLES DEGARMO (Swarthmore College):—

“I had a query in my mind last night which has been partially answered by the questions and answers already given. A part of that query still remains, and that refers to the educational side of this question. The first query was, is not this like-mindedness more a feeling, a social feeling, than it is a social intelligence, and, if that is true, is it not perfectly legitimate to develop social feelings? The one instance was given of a bad social education, namely, that aroused by revivals. Now, I am just wondering whether that is at bottom a bad education. First of all, it is pre-eminently a social training, and the question whether it is bad or not will have to be determined not so much by a formal principle as by a condition of it. What sort of a social feeling does it develop? Where have the great mobs been? I think France is perhaps noted for that sort of phenomenon, and yet no one accuses the religious sentiment of that country of exerting any influence in this matter. The Catholic church is free from the revival spirit, which has belonged largely in the past to the Methodist church. It is now passing from that to the Salvation Army. It was characteristic of a primitive state of our society. The revival meetings were held, I should say, where the mob principle does not rule, and I cannot see, therefore, that there is very much force in that statement. We must take the conditions into consideration. The negroes in the South were mentioned as a people given to that sort of feeling, and yet if one looks at the South one sees that it is not among the people who

attend revivals that this feeling exists, but among the people who do not participate in these revivals. The mobs are from the whites in the South and not from the negroes. I should, therefore, like to have a little further light upon this point; how largely the sort of feeling must be taken into consideration, and whether an appeal to feeling is a bad thing and taking the people in a wrong way."

Professor GIDDINGS:—

"I think I detect three questions in the remarks made by Dr. DeGarmo. The first is, whether like-mindedness is chiefly a matter of feeling or of intelligence. It is neither. It is at the bottom a like-responsiveness to the same impulse; the fundamental psychological fact of sensation and reaction. If, as I have elsewhere expressed it, two children are simultaneously, or not necessarily simultaneously, but in like manner, pleased by the color red, these two children are to that extent psychologically alike. Or, to take a different example, if one hundred men sell securities on a rumor of war, they are affected in the same way by the same impulse. Like-mindedness is a similarity of brain and nervous organization, so that two or more men respond in the same way to the same impulse; consequently, you may get either feeling or intelligence in your like-mindedness as a secondary fact.

"As to the point brought up by Dr. DeGarmo in reference to the Roman Catholic church, I should say that this church, in Spain, for instance, has certainly shown antagonism to the revival spirit. But Spain shows to-day the result of simply another method of accomplishing the same thing that the revival spirit accomplishes. I say that revival work is deleterious in its effects not on account of its appeal to feeling as such, but because that appeal is coupled with the statement that a man must act first and think afterward. That is just what the Roman Catholic church teaches; you must obey authority first, and you must not criticise; you must do as you are told. That, too, is what the revivalist says; put aside criticism! do not think!

"I now come to the question of the negroes and mobs in the South. If you will take the trouble to make two maps of the United States and locate on one of them the places where, all through the years preceding the civil war, and immediately after the civil war, revivals were carried on in the most thoroughgoing fashion among the whites, and on the other locate the places where the lynchings have taken place in the last ten years, you will find that those maps agree."

Professor ROBERT LAIRD STEWART (Lincoln University):—

"I think we shall all agree that where there is fanaticism the outcome cannot be good, but only evil. We know that there is a great deal of that for lack of knowledge, in connection with the so-called revivals among the negroes of the South. I must say, however, that I



think it is hardly fair to present that as an instance of what is really meant by revival influence in general in our day. It seems to me it is wrong to couple the work that Mr. Moody has been doing with that kind of influence. I have felt that one statement ought not to go unchallenged in the address of Professor Giddings, to which I listened with great pleasure, and that was in connection with revival meetings. We must look at this thing in its immediate bearing upon society, for we are here to investigate the influences that bear upon the good of the community. As a matter of fact anything that is uplifting in its nature in individual cases will be a benefit to society. I have frequently been on the track of Mr. Moody, as he has passed through this country and other countries, and I am here to testify that a blessed influence has followed his work, a work which has been going on for over thirty years. The great revival of 1857 that swept over this land resulted in good. I could take you to communities that have been awakened and uplifted by that influence, and are now the most law-abiding communities in our land. In Western Pennsylvania to-day good results for society are still seen from the movements which were started in the time of that great revival. Spiritual influences are the greatest uplifting power we have. I wish to say also that I have never heard an address from Mr. Moody, or from others who were laboring earnestly to bring men to Christ, in which they have demanded that men should surrender themselves without thought. They are asked to think and to choose; and I have heard from Mr. Moody's lips and from his associates some of the most earnest presentations of truth that men might think and might act. They plead with men to consider their ways; to repent of sin; to search the Scriptures; to choose between right and wrong, Christ and Belial. The results which have followed are not due to hypnotic influences, but the divine power which accompanies the presentation of truth. These effects have followed the preaching of the gospel since the day of Pentecost."

Mr. JOHN J. CHAPMAN (New York):—

"I am on the side of the revivalist. I cannot see what any of us are at except to work for the good of the individual, and I am unable to believe that Professor Giddings, or any one who has as much obvious benevolence in his appearance, cares for anything else. It is all a question of how this thing is manifested. The Salvation Army is the religious expression of this feeling and acts as a means of individual growth to a certain type of man."

Professor JOHN J. McNULTY (College of the City of New York):—

"Of course I feel compelled, as every one else who listened to Professor Giddings' address, to testify to its excellence. There is a

certain quality of mind, however, which Professor Giddings has failed to consider, and that is the mind of the genius. Such a mind displays one fact and that is that the genius acts on the impulse. How, therefore, would he qualify his statement in order to make room for the spirit of the genius in relation to social progress?"

Rev. SAMUEL J. DIKE, D. D. (Auburndale, Mass.):—

"How would the sociologist regard the men of genius and the men of the highest culture who act both from feeling and intelligence, with a more or less proportionate distribution of the two? I would ask if it is not the combination of these two qualities which gives us the different grades of society?"

Rev. R. I. HOLAND, S. J. (Woodstock College, Maryland):—

"I wish to qualify a statement of Professor Giddings. There are occasions when a man is not obliged to deliberate before acting. He need not think and consider a long time before paying a debt for instance. A man must be sure that an impulse is right and that the command comes from the right authority, and deliberation is not then always necessary."

Professor GIDDINGS:—

"As to the method by which we are to control impulsive action in the community, that is a question which is directly related to what was asked in regard to the classes of society by Dr. Dike, and with what was asked about the genius by Dr. McNulty. I think that I perfectly agree with what Dr. Dike and Professor McNulty say. I think with Dr. Dike that we do have just those gradations in society, and I think with Professor McNulty that the genius is quite a distinct element in our problem and that he largely does act from impulse, and that it is only some time after he has acted that we begin to analyze the result. The answer that I have to make in regard to the genius really contains the answer to all the other questions.

"Not so very long ago an Italian anthropologist wrote an interesting book in which he tried to prove that the genius is a kind of lunatic. I am sure we do not accept that conclusion. But it is true that men of genius are in their nervous organization very often extremely like men of unbalanced mind, and it is moreover true that men of genius very often become lunatics. There seems to be a connection between the two which we are not able to understand; yet the community does discriminate in regard to two classes of men who claim to be geniuses, or who are regarded as geniuses by some one or other. It says some of those men are geniuses and some are cranks. How does society decide? Does it decide by impulse? It does not; it decides by criticism. All that we mean by sound progress in art, literature and music is summed up in two words: the genius, and the criticism of the

works of genius. All that I have to say just now is this: that we cannot get on in society, we do not want to get on in society, without the man of feeling, without the man of impulse, without the man of genius. They are the motive forces that carry society on to higher and better things, but we must know in what direction we are going. We must know whether the impulse we follow is a right impulse; we must know whether the authority is a right authority. I also want to say that the objections which I raised were to the methods of the revivalist, not to revivals, and what I have to say about those methods is that they destroy the spirit of calm, critical inquiry. It is necessary for society to know whether we are going right or wrong. And, finally, I may say in reply to one other question, namely, shall we stop and consider before paying a debt, that if there is any doubt in my mind as to whether I owe the debt I shall stop and think over it for a long time."

At the fourth and last session, on Wednesday morning, April 13, the topic of the relation of sociology to philanthropy was discussed. Dr. Frederick H. Wines, secretary of the State Board of Charities in Illinois, and the special agent on pauperism and crime of the United States census in 1880 and 1890, opened the discussion with a paper on "Sociology and Philanthropy," which was read by the present writer in Dr. Wines' absence. Dr. Wines expected to be in attendance, but was prevented by the urgent relief work at Shawnee, Ill., which was placed in his charge. His paper is printed in full in this number of the ANNALS, and should be read in connection with this report. Dr. Wines made an earnest plea not for the identification of sociology and philanthropy, but for the mutual recognition on the part of students and workers of the aid which each group can render to the other through intimate and friendly relations being established. Dr. E. T. Devine, secretary of the Charity Organization Society of New York City, was expected to speak on the recent "Results of Sociological Investigation in Practical Philanthropy," but though in attendance at the earlier sessions of the annual meeting, Dr. Devine was taken sick while here and we were deprived of the pleasure of listening to him on a subject with which he

is so familiar. Miss Mary E. Richmond, secretary of the Charity Organization Society of Baltimore, came next on the program, and spoke on the "Training of Philanthropic Workers," the point of contact *par excellence* between students of sociology and practical workers in philanthropy. The following is a partial report of Miss Richmond's remarks, together with a summary of the subsequent discussion:

"In taking up the subject of 'The Training of Philanthropic Workers' I am going to limit myself to paid charity workers. The training of voluntary workers is quite a different matter. First of all, what is the position of paid charity workers to-day? I think it can be safely said that there is an absence of any standard among such workers. It is true that some have received highly specialized training in their own department; for instance, where medical and charity work overlap. Also, there are skilled nurses engaged in district work, but very often they have had no training whatever as charity workers. Take our institutions that demand a medical superintendent; the superintendent generally sacrifices the charity side to the medical side at every turn. He has a very definite standard as far as medicine is concerned, but lacks a standard in charity work.

"Then I have noticed among our charity workers an absence even of a common language, not to mention the like-mindedness of which we heard yesterday. For instance, we had an experience recently: A trained kindergartner, who had done a great deal of charity work in Baltimore, was approached on the subject of a certain family where, in the opinion of the Charity Organization Society, the daughter was neglecting the mother. The mother was a dependent, and the daughter was assuming no responsibility whatever. The kindergartner was helping the family, and we asked her whether the daughter ought not to be required to help the mother. 'Oh, no,' she said, 'that would pauperize the daughter.' We were looking at the problem from two different points of view while dealing with the same family. She evidently thought that a reduction of income meant pauperism. We felt that pauperism was a deterioration of character; that it was a habit of mind rather than a condition of pocketbook. This same kindergartner was helping a family where there was a very bright little girl, and she allowed this child to report to her the material needs of the family. The object of the kindergarten, as I understand it, is symmetrical development; yet she looked upon the child as the head of the family, and placed the mother and father quite in the background.

I simply cite these as illustrations of the fact that charity workers lack a common terminology and a common aim. However intelligent these workers may be, however skilled in their own department, they lack that knowledge of the relation of the parts to the whole which is necessary to do effective work.

"Though the kindergartner and the nurse get special training, I may add that the greater number of charity workers receive no training whatever. No training is provided in charity organization work, although that is becoming a highly specialized department. The need of training in this department of work has become so urgent that some societies have a sort of training school for their own agents. In Baltimore, formerly, when we were in search of a person to put in charge of a district office, we looked the field over for a middle-aged woman desirous of doing good in the world, but now, like the other large societies, we take agents in training. They are trained for a period of six or eight months before they are allowed to do any work at all, except under immediate supervision and direction.

"The present plan does not meet all our needs, however. To do charity organization work it is necessary to have not only a knowledge of the details of that work, but a general outlook on the whole field. It is necessary to secure co-operation with other societies and to have a sympathetic knowledge of their point of view; to have an understanding of the principles and difficulties of relief work and institutional work. This can only be brought about by systematic training.

"I know half a dozen charities that are seeking trained, paid leadership, and at the present time there seems to be no adequate supply of such workers. The colleges are turning out young men who have had some training in the theory of charity work, but these young men have had an expensive training and are looking forward to departments of work that offer higher rewards than charity workers receive. In the second place, the young man just out of college has had a pretty thorough equipment in theory but lacks knowledge on many practical points that the charity worker needs to have. He must have had experience of life among the poor, but he also needs a knowledge of life at first hand. The young man who has been given a position at the head of charitable societies has not always known how to deal with the business man, with the church worker and others with whom he has come in contact, and he has sometimes been a failure for this reason. In fact, no two charity organization societies are exactly alike; they must vary, and so the successful worker must adapt himself to the peculiar conditions of his own society.

"The question is, how are we going to get trained workers? The only suggestion I have to offer is the establishment of a training

school for paid charity workers, a training school where teaching and training should go hand-in-hand. The school should be located in a large city where practical work would be plentiful. Its teachers should be university graduates who have had adequate training in the social sciences, but who, at the same time, have had practical work in charities—just as much practical work as theory. They should be prepared to study and adapt themselves to the needs of the charities of the country. Such a school should be endowed, and might either be connected with some university in a large city, or else, and preferably, as I believe, might be quite independent. There is this objection to any academic connection: a great institution of learning casts a big shadow; and the immediate needs of the charities might not be so much considered as the traditions of the institution.

"I should like to see the school provide systematic training for workers in many branches of charity. Co-operation becomes natural when you have taken training side-by-side in institutional work and in the work of relief societies, charity organization societies and child-saving agencies; there are a number of things that ought to be learned in common. Such training should be begun by giving certain courses to all alike; then the classes could be divided and specialized later. The plan is, of course, as yet, very vague; but carried out properly it would meet a growing demand.

"It occurred to me that a theory, and a rather vague theory at that, might properly be brought here. Before most audiences it would be necessary for me to have found not only the endowment, but the right leader for such work before I could get a hearing for the plan. No such necessity limits me here. I hope you will criticise the plan very freely, for we charity workers need the trained thinking that you can bring to bear upon it."

Professor C. S. WALKER:—

"I should like to ask Miss Richmond whether the training schools in connection with the Young Men's Christian Associations, the College for Training in Christian Science in Springfield, Mass., and such kindred institutions supply at all the demand for these trained workers?"

Miss RICHMOND:—

"I have examined the curriculum of the college at Springfield, to which you refer, and I should say that it did not meet our demand. There are still members of the Young Men's Christian Association who do not approve of the trained secretaries. They claim that when the trained secretary goes into a small town he expects too many things. This, it seems to me, is an admirable endorsement of the school in a way. If the school trains the secretaries to want more,

they will get more; it is clear that they have a high ideal of what a secretary should be and do. The school I have outlined, however, must meet other needs."

Mr. F. H. McLEAN (Fellow in Sociology, University of Pennsylvania):

"While I fully agree with Miss Richmond's statement that special training is necessary it has always been a question with me whether the necessity for a separate school for that training exists. It seems to me that you could not get the full advantage from a school of this kind. We, in a way, need to obtain an outlook of much that falls outside of ordinary charities. In the last few years Professor Giddings has gotten his students interested in a number of specialized subjects in New York City. However, I would not at this moment say that that would fully meet the need.

"It was my fortune last year to make a directory of the charities in one of the larger cities of the country. It was surprising to see how many heads of different charities there were who did not know what the object of their charity was. In many cases they filled up a sheet or two in describing special objects of their organization but without any conception of the central thought about which that organization was built. In regard to a point suggested by the paper of Dr. Wines, it is interesting to note the stages in mental development in practical workers who have had very little theoretical training. This is particularly true of voluntary workers. At the beginning they look at everything from a personal standpoint, having no idea of what the final results of their acts will accomplish in so far as the spiritual side of those human beings with whom they come in contact is concerned. With greater experience they begin to see that it is not a mere matter of satisfying material wants. They then have reached the second stage and accept general principles which they apply to all cases which appear to come within the sphere of those principles. Of course that is a better state of mind than the first, but still imperfect. No true charity worker can go on without recognizing the fact that exceptions to rules are about as frequent as the cases in which they apply. The third stage, where the psychological analysis of the character of those with whom they are dealing is required, is hard for these practical workers to attain, even though they have been in the work for a long time. A theoretical training is necessary, therefore, to master these three stages."

Rev. Dr. SAMUEL W. DIKE (Auburndale, Mass.):—

"Our women's colleges are turning out large numbers of bright, enthusiastic, well-trained young women, who, as a general thing, have been seeking employment as teachers. They tell me that the

number of applicants is far out-running the number of positions. Since social science is being taught in our women's colleges and in co-educational institutions, we find that our women's clubs, which were formerly interested in literature, history and art, are beginning to attack social questions. I should like to know how far these institutions are providing for the training of women along this line. It has seemed to me that this would be one of the channels where college trained women would find a place."

Miss RICHMOND:—

"The experience of some of the leaders in Boston charities has led them to think that the women who have just come out of college are, generally, not a success in this work. They feel that the young woman just out of college has been removed from life and its normal relations for four or five years, and that until she gets readjusted and has had some first-hand experience of life, she is an impractical person in charitable work. The young women just out of college are not in a position to take leading places as paid workers and are not willing to begin at the bottom, although that, practically, is where they belong. Even an elderly church missionary, who has never heard of charitable or social theory, can go far ahead of these beginners in realizing and relieving the actual needs of a distressed family."

Professor E. J. JAMES (Chicago University):—

"I feel that the question being discussed is an extremely important one and that the two sides have been well brought out. The college graduate who finishes his course and who has any particular taste for this branch of subjects is looking forward to a career with a higher salary. The college graduate who is willing to take such a position for a year or two should expect a small salary. They are really not worth anything in the first year or two of their work, and they ought to be willing to pay for the experience they are getting. As a general thing they take such positions only for a time and know that they will not continue in that work. My observation bears out the view that Miss Richmond has expressed, namely, that in such work we do not get hold of the men who are worth anything. I should say that so long as women are satisfied with a smaller return for their services than men are, we have at least the possibility of finding efficient workers in the ranks of cultivated college women. What the university is actually doing for the training of young men and women in these subjects, I would like to hear from Dr. Lindsay who has had a special interest in this problem under conditions which are extremely favorable. He has been trying to solve a part of the problem."

DR. LINDSAY:—

"I have no doubt that a special school is needed for the training of



a certain class of persons who are to engage in charity work, especially paid workers, and that it will come in time. But, it seems to me that a more important question is how to provide for the very much larger number of individuals who want a little training, largely for voluntary work, and who could not be taken into a special school without spoiling the very idea of the school, but who can be made a hundred times more useful if they get a little training. In the first place, the college and the university should provide some training in these practical lines for all students whether they expect to take up this work or not. By this means it will be possible to stir up their interest in the questions of practical philanthropy which are being worked out. At the University of Pennsylvania we are trying to do this in the Wharton School; part of the instruction consisting of courses in practical sociology and social economics. One great difficulty, which has already been alluded to in our discussions, is the lack of suitable text-books to be used in work of this kind.

"A second way that this training might be provided for other than by the special school proposed, would be by the opening up of special courses in our colleges and universities. We have already broken up by the elective system the old idea of the courses in a college being a fixed thing. The elective system, however, has its weak point in one direction, namely, that every pupil is not wise enough to choose in the very best way for himself. The professor in charge, or the dean of the department has a large number of students to look after and cannot give much personal attention to an individual who desires to map out the best possible course looking to a definite career. Parents, as a rule, have not the ability to give the needed advice, and the student is at a loss to choose the very best combination of things. In our large universities we want a number of courses looking toward special ends. We need to have a number of combinations in our curriculum; one combination of a certain set of subjects being suited to those who expect to go into business, another combination suited to those who expect to go into law, still another for those who expect to go into practical philanthropic work, and so on. These courses should be combinations of highly specialized courses with a broad basis of general culture in the early years. The philanthropist talks about sociology as not being of much value to him. The course he has in mind may not be of value for his special work. He asks what the habits of primitive man have to do with practical philanthropy. But that kind of sociological course may be very useful to the future student of law and jurisprudence. The philanthropist needs a course in sociology adapted to his work. We want to get into each of these specialized courses a large number of subjects dealing with things that

will be of interest to persons looking forward to definite careers. Courses must be arranged by the colleges and universities which can be thrown open to persons who want some one thing without any reference to a degree as well as to students who are candidates in regular standing for a degree. In the graduate work of some institutions such provision is made.

"Another difficulty is to make those now engaged in philanthropic work see the need for a training other than they have had. I think that the Charity Organization Society will find that it has, in the long run, something to gain by offering its facilities to all students interested in the subject, and by devoting a little more time to encouraging students to co-operate with it. I have taken a number of students and placed them around in the different charity organization societies, selecting students who were willing to give a fair return in service for all they received. I have in mind one of my students who did a large amount of good work in the service of the Charity Organization Society, in New York, in return for the training he was getting out of it. Most of you are doubtless familiar with the plans announced this year in New York, where the Charity Organization Society offers to take a certain number of persons in its office for several weeks during the summer, assigning them certain work to do, and giving them the benefit of the records and of direct supervision. Another year they will go a step farther if this plan is successful, and have special instruction given to such persons. A number of lectures are to be given this year, but without any attempt to provide systematic courses.

"I think we have every reason to feel encouraged and to expect from the forces now at work in our colleges and universities that something will be materially added to practical work in charity; there is a broader outlook, a more scientific attitude toward these subjects. The demand for a special school exists and we must have that in time. Apart from that, however, is the other pressing problem of how to reach the large number of persons who constitute the existing army of practical voluntary workers."

Professor C. S. WALKER (State Agricultural College, Amherst, Mass):—

"I should like to ask what is the relation of the College Settlement houses, like the Hull House in Chicago, for instance, toward this question. There are a number of women living at these houses who are going out to do work in the slums."

Mr. F. H. McLEAN:—

"I should say that College and University Settlement work does undoubtedly give an outlook upon certain sorts of charities; but the

people that you meet in the University Settlement are not those that you most frequently meet in connection with the general charities of a city. Of course the idea of the University Settlement is simply to do away with artificial class distinctions, and the work is mostly with self-respecting people who are not in need of general charity. The number of those who can live at the University Settlement is small, and we could not, therefore, do a very extended work in this direction. One can get there an admirable outlook on social work, but is not confined to the charitable side of the question."

Mrs. SARA L. OBERHOLTZER (Philadelphia):—

"I believe in the school for training workers. I should like to call your attention, however, to the school savings banks which have been established in over 400 schools in the United States. In Girard College in this city, they have such a bank, and, according to a report received recently from Tacoma, Washington, one thousand children there had deposited \$200. The idea of such school savings banks is to train the children to save. If we train people to save we will not have so many paupers and will not need so many trained workers. If we will train the children, the children of the poor, to save small amounts of money and to use their money to the best advantage, there will be less need for charity workers."

Rev. R. I. HOLAND, S. J. (Woodstock College, Maryland):—

"The difficulty in charity work is in those who go into this work. Those who could be most useful, it seems to me, are medical students, law students and theological students, because they come in close contact with the poor more often than others. But, take medical students, for instance, what chances have they to make a living by making themselves agents of charitable institutions? They say a man must have technical knowledge if he wants to be very efficient, and, at the same time, a great many charities need persons with executive ability. It is difficult to find men who have both. I have seen a few cases in which the superintendent of an institution was a competent man, but comparatively few, because, generally, such men do not understand anything about business and the government of the house. I should say the chances of promotion in such work are much greater for those who have the foundation of knowledge in law or medicine."

Rev. WALTER LAIDLAW (New York City):—

"I should like to say a word about the difficulty of getting trained institutional workers. I have in mind one institution where it was found necessary in the course of four years to have as many superintendents. It was really impossible to go to any quarter of the country and to be certain of securing men of heart and mind combined. The question of the training of charity workers is a large problem, and I

am sure Miss Richmond has enabled me to realize that it is a larger problem than I had before imagined. In connection with what Dr. Lindsay said, I have thought that if we could have something introduced in this work parallel to the hospital appointments which now obtain in our medical colleges, we would to some extent be meeting the want. If we could have students appointed to charitable institutions, which were recognized by the universities to be of the first order of administrative work, to there receive a practical training, I should think that would be recognized, as in the case of many medical men, as a direct step toward preferential advancement. Charity organization societies cover our country now, and perhaps at the next National Conference of Charities and Corrections propositions will be brought forward which will lead to the training of workers. I have thought it would be useful if there could be a well-digested body of information which could be transmitted through correspondence and made available to the practical students of charitable work."

Professor WILLIAM I. HULL (Swarthmore College):—

"There are two conditions which confront us in this question: first, the need for both kinds of training, the theoretical training and the practical knowledge of details. Dr. Lindsay has spoken of the most hopeful method which is being resorted to at the present time for giving these two kinds of training, namely, special courses dealing with social problems, and the opportunities extended to college students to spend their forces in study at first-hand in the work of charitable associations and college settlements.

"The second condition which confronts us, a very important one indeed, is the fact that the financial inducement held out to young men and women to engage in social service is not sufficient. If we are going to care for our poor in the best possible way, we must recognize the truth that in this line of work, above all others, perhaps, the laborer is worthy of his hire. There is not merely a need for trained workers; there is also a great need for the education of the public regarding this phase of the wages question. I do not think that college women and men *are* too valuable as philanthropic workers; no one can be too valuable for such work. Let us train the very best elements of our people in both a practical and theoretical way, and then let us hold out to them sufficient inducement to bring them into the work."

Professor JAMES:—

"I have given a good deal of attention to the question of organizing these special courses in connection with the universities. The difficulties we meet with on the side of the universities are mainly with reference to the degrees. Another difficulty is that you cannot undertake

to train people of widely different elementary education to work together. It has seemed to me that, in connection with our American universities, we might overcome some of these difficulties in the same way that the Germans have solved some of their questions. For instance, in the University of Berlin they have what is called a Seminary of Oriental Languages. This course is open not only to students, but is intended to acquaint all who are willing to take a course on the practical side of Oriental languages. The difficulty in such a scheme is, if the university students rush into such a course you cannot direct the training to meet the needs of those who have not had such a thorough elementary education. There should be found some neutral point where the university and outsider might meet. My idea is that there should be an attempt on the part of the university to solve these problems in practical life."

MISS RICHMOND:—

"I am very much indebted to the Academy for the opportunity of hearing what people think on this important question. The question of demand and supply has been brought up, but as I am not a political economist I will pass that over. I would say, however, that I have noticed whenever a trained worker goes to a community and makes a marked success, the demand for trained workers is increased and the pay is increased. As to the universities and their training, as opposed to practical training, I think there is need for both. When there are more trained workers, the managers of institutions will recognize that good intentions are not enough; that it is essential to know as well as to do. At present a large mass of valuable experience that could be turned to account in training students in such a school as I have tried to describe, is not being used. The fact that persons with such experience were not university graduates would not debar them from teaching in a training school. We are at present making almost every department of effort a means of training; why should not the practice of charity work be made a means of education outside of the universities? There are people who feel a call for this work; the class that formerly became foreign missionaries are now realizing that there is a great work to be done at home."

## II. THE THEORY OF SOCIOLOGY.

At the second session, on Tuesday morning, April 12, after the discussion on the annual address, the specific topic for the morning covered certain questions of sociological

theory. In the first place, Professor L. S. Rowe, of the University of Pennsylvania, read a paper on "Sociology and Politics," in which he discussed the influence of sociological research upon political science. This paper will be printed in full in a future number of the ANNALS, and hence only an abstract of the argument will be given here. Dr. Rowe spoke first of sociology as a gleaner in the field of human relations—psychological, physical, ethical and political—and called attention to the analogy between the work which sociology is now doing in emphasizing neglected factors and in calling attention to data altogether overlooked even within the limits of some of the special social sciences. Sociology is making a more intensive study of motives with the important result that the wide discrepancy between individual and groupal action has been shown. More particularly has sociology demonstrated that the groupal relations of the individual cannot be explained on the basis of the rationalism of Rousseau or the utilitarianism of Bentham. Much of the reasoning of writers on politics is vitiated by the fact that they deal with a mannikin rather than with a real man. It is also necessary to study the political psychology of modern nations, and this work has been begun by the sociologists. Professor Rowe then analyzed the appeal to individual interest in the recent agitations for political reform, showing that it was inadequate because it presupposes too great an ability on the part of the average individual to discount the future and to weigh a great future good over against an immediate satisfaction.

In the next place it was asked if utilitarian motives do not account for political activity, how can the devotion to public welfare, of which there are many examples in modern times, be explained? Professor Rowe's answer to this question consisted of an interesting demonstration that such phenomena are due to a combination of social forces which we class as political ideals. Social instincts and sentiments,

beliefs and feelings are combined variously to create these ideals and to formulate them in such expressions as "liberty, equality, fraternity," "sovereignty of the people," etc. To illustrate the formation of such political ideals and their influence in real life, Professor Rowe compared the political conditions in America with those in France. He claimed that the differences in American and French political ideals consist in their relation to the historical antecedents of the two nations. These differences were brought out by many happy illustrations, and in conclusion Dr. Rowe referred again to the fact that much of the work now being done in theoretical sociology is destined to furnish a basis for a much deeper and truer analysis of the phenomena of which political science treats.

In discussing Dr. Rowe's paper, John Jay Chapman, Esq., of New York, spoke on the nature and essence of government, treating particularly of the social psychology of the governed in their relations to governmental activity.

Following Mr. Chapman's discussion, the present writer presented a paper on the "Unit of Investigation or Consideration in Sociology." This will also be printed in full in a subsequent number of the ANNALS, and I need only devote a few words of general outline in order to introduce the discussion which followed. I discussed the unifying results in other sciences due largely in my opinion to the possession of a common unit of consideration which served as a common starting point in theoretical discussions, a common meeting ground at nearly every stage of scientific deduction and a common goal for investigation. In this sense the cell in biology, the atom and molecule in chemistry and physics and the sensation in psychology may be regarded. In seeking for a similar unit in sociology which may, like the other units, be variously defined by different writers, I have selected what I call the "social imperative" not as a metaphysical entity, but as a concrete and given fact in society. It is the "social ought" which makes me

think and act differently in the presence of any other human being or group of human beings from the way in which I think and act when alone. This modification is the primary fact for the theory of sociology, the starting point and the goal of sociological interpretation, very much as the sensation is for psychology. In the course of my paper I also discussed the various units hitherto adopted by sociological writers, namely, the family, the social man and the social type, and endeavored to show that the "social imperative" had an advantage in that it is a variable unit and may also be objectively studied and measured as embodied in social institutions. The following is a summary of the discussion of this topic:

Dr. ARTHUR FAIRBANKS (Yale University):—

"In listening to Dr. Lindsay's paper it seemed to me rather strange that the social imperative should be chosen as the unit of investigation in sociology. I think the difficulty in comprehending that phrase, however, was in our understanding of the term 'unit of investigation.' As you have noticed the different points in the paper, you have seen that other phrases have frequently been substituted for it which are entirely clear. It seems to me that the social imperative instead of being the starting point of investigation should rather be the meeting ground of investigators. I would be very glad to agree to that.

"It seems to me also that we cannot too much emphasize the close connection between psychology and sociology. The psychologist is coming to feel that the individual mind is what it is, because of the common mental life of the society in which that mind is formed and in which it lives. If I understand the work of the sociologist rightly, he is studying society as it bears on the individual mind. The two facts correspond. We may, of course, use that phrase 'social imperative' as the name for the influence which is exerted upon the individual, and interpreted in that way it seems to me we have an exceedingly valuable point for the work of sociology. Contrast that with some of the other starting points which sociology has selected in the hands of different investigators. One man begins with the study of social forces. He finds certain forces, forces which are not homogeneous, and the result is a very heterogeneous and mixed mass of material which he gathers. If he started with the thought presented this morning, the influence of society as it bears on this individual



and on that, he would have been starting with the fundamental fact of sociology and whatever errors he might have made would have been checked by the fact that he was starting with and coming back to this one central truth. Or if one begins as some sociologists have begun with a so-called organic conception of society, if one starts with a figure of speech and attempts to explain society by reference to that figure of speech, he is explaining the figure and not the fact, and, therefore, his results are not useful to any except the few who understand the starting point. One might also have begun with the study of different institutions, taking one institution at a time, and have arrived at conclusions which are extremely variable. But that study does not, perhaps, deserve the name of sociology as a science, as it does not centre around the one important fact of sociology.

"This thought of the social imperative, taken as the central point of the study, the influence of a group of minds upon each individual mind of that group, will be exceedingly profitable and exceedingly beneficial for the future of sociology. In our study of institutions it gives us that general view which enables us to fit particular facts which we gather into the general system with which it is important for us to correlate every fact which we gain. But, if we call this the unit of investigation, that immediately raises some other questions and it seems to me that the phrase is an unfortunate one. We understand what it means when an atom is spoken of as the unit of investigation in chemistry, when the cell is spoken of as the unit of investigation in biology, or sensation in psychology. For the time being it is assumed to be a given datum for the work that is being carried on. It is not to be analyzed, it is something fixed, something that all investigators accept as reasonable, and that, therefore, can be used alike by different men. It is in that sense, tangible; a unit that can be grasped and applied in investigation.

"I think it is an open question whether any such thing is possible for the science of sociology. It is a question whether the economist has really succeeded in finding such a thing; perhaps he has, but for the sociologist the study of forces is even more complex than for the economist. In physics we can take our molecule; we do not analyze it into the atom. We take it as it is. If an atom is in one molecule, it is not at the same time in another. In analyzing society, I suppose its atom might be called the individual. But this individual instead of being always in the same molecule is in a great many different molecules at once. He is connected with one group by business relations, with another by church, with another by family, and so on, until he is to be found in many different groups. The matter is a very complex one for the sociologist. If you take the individual as the unit of

investigation, you are thereby letting go of the fact that each one is to be found in different circles and different groups. Consequently, the effort to find a real unit of investigation in sociology, while it may not be impossible, is exceedingly difficult, and perhaps the problem is one that we are not yet ready to solve.

"As for the particular unit which has been suggested it seems to me that it is in the first place too general, too vague, to be useful as a unit of investigation. It is really too variable to be a successful unit. A variable unit is what we need, but if we get a unit of investigation which varies with each individual of society, we have a unit so variable that we cannot handle it. My feeling is that a most important fact has been presented in Dr. Lindsay's paper. But I should say that the group is rather the unit than the social imperative, and that to call the social imperative the unit of investigation is to apply a wrong name to it."

Professor GIDDINGS :--

"I was very greatly interested in Professor Lindsay's paper and I find myself in very hearty agreement with him in general. I thought that he was certainly on the right track, that he had taken, in his analysis, a long step toward the determination of the true unit of investigation in sociology. When he told us that the social imperative was the phenomenon to be investigated by the sociologist, I could see that there was one good reason for studying the matter in that way. The unit of investigation in political science is sovereignty; it is simply one form of the social imperative, a specific form. Political science is a specialized development of our whole scheme of social science or social philosophy. If, then, we are quite right in arguing that sovereignty is the unit of investigation in political science, it is entirely true to say that the social imperative in some form, or expressed in some way, whether we use those words or not, certainly is either the unit of investigation in sociology or it, by implication, contains that unit of investigation.

"When does a social imperative appear in its simplest possible form? It appears, and every one knows that it appears, when any one of us stands in the presence of another human being. All that is necessary to create your social imperative is that perfectly simple social situation. If I am by myself thinking my own thoughts the social imperative is not felt; but as soon as I am confronted by my fellow-man I do not think my own thoughts in quite the same way, and as I look into his eye I feel the social imperative, and he feels it when he looks at me. The social imperative arises in its simplest form when you and I are in the presence of the other fellow. The existence of that other fellow, what he is, what he does to you, the influence he has upon you, are

the phenomena of your social imperative. Then, if you get out of that phenomenon of the other fellow, what he is, what he does, as the biologist gets out of the phenomenon of the cell all that there is in it, you have obtained your whole system of social imperative. It so happens that our very word 'sociology' is derived from the simple Latin name of the other fellow:—the *socius*. I should say that just as the cell is the unit of investigation in biology; just as sensation is the unit of investigation in psychology, the social imperative is the unit of investigation in sociology."

Professor C. S. WALKER :—

"In illustrating this unit of investigation in sociology, it seems to me that Professor Giddings hardly brought out that in which consists the knowledge of the other fellow. I may study the other fellow and still have no primary conception of what sociology is, because sociology is not the other fellow, nor myself; it is the relation existing between the other fellow and me. But when we bring in a third fellow and 65,000,000 or 200,000,000 other fellows and try to get the relation existing between all those, we have a very complex problem. The paper by Dr. Lindsay was in the direct line of truth. It is very necessary that we should find out this social imperative; I think there is the *sine qua non*. What is it which constitutes society? It is not one individual; it is the relation existing between many individuals."

Professor J. J. McNULTY :—

"I should like to say a word as to the relation of sociology to its allied sciences. When it was stated that the unit of investigation was observed in the relation between myself and the other fellow, one important point, at least from the psychological standpoint, remained unnoticed and that was that the other fellow was the picture of myself. According to Ross and Baldwin the social imperative means emotion. It seems to me that the fact that man is born in society and that he takes on this power of retrospection, to see himself in this other fellow and understands the other fellow through himself, makes it clear that sociology is naturally a developed psychology."

### III. THE TEACHING OF SOCIOLOGY AND THE SOCIAL SCIENCES.

In the treatment of this topic at the third session on Tuesday afternoon, April 12, particular reference was made to existing conditions in high schools and colleges rather than universities, and the term "social sciences" was construed in its broadest sense to include economics and political

economy (economic theory and history, money and banking), sociology and statistics, political science and politics (civics, finance and taxation).

Professor John L. Stewart, of the Central Manual Training School of Philadelphia, was asked to discuss the distinctive High School Problem. He spoke in part as follows:

"Concerning the desirability of teaching political economy in secondary schools there exists great difference of opinion. There are those who believe that economics and its allied subjects have no place in the curriculum of a high school, while there are others who are equally confident that the high school is far from doing its duty by the community in neglecting such essentially important studies. Six years ago there was held at Madison, Wisconsin, a conference of prominent teachers whose object was to devise a scheme of study in history and civics suitable for schools of high school grade. The conference was emphatic in its recommendations concerning history and civics but reported against the teaching of political economy, presenting the following resolutions:

"'9 *Resolved*, That formal instruction in political economy be omitted from the school program; but that economic subjects be treated in connection with other pertinent subjects. . . .

"'30. *Resolved*, That no formal instruction in political economy be given in the secondary schools, but that, in connection particularly with United States history, civil government and commercial geography, instruction be given in those economic topics, a knowledge of which is essential to the understanding of our economic life and development.'

"The conference insisted that political economy should not be introduced as a distinct and separate science; but as illustrating government and political questions. In connection with Resolution No. 30 there was adopted the following memorandum:

"'It is suggested, for example, that when the tariff history of the United States is being studied, the laws of value, the conditions of production, and the principles of exchange, especially as relating to international trade, be explained; that in connection with the study of the development of means of transportation, such topics as the concentration of population and of industry, the organic character of society, the corporate organization of industry, the capitalistic mode of production, the process of distribution, monopolies, labor organizations, etc., be discussed; that in connection with a study of Jackson's administration, the subjects of crises, banks and their functions, the

functions of money, the laws of its circulation, bimetallism, paper money, and kindred topics be presented; that in connection with the study of our great wars, certain topics in finance be introduced, as for example the principles of war finances, the history of our debt, the process of debt conversion, and the methods of paying public debts; that in connection with the study of civil government, such topics as the assessment and collection of taxes, the principles of taxation, the kinds of taxes, the functions of government, the formation and vote of the budget, the expenses of government, etc., be studied.

“‘In making these recommendations the conference does not intend to suggest that less time than is customary be given to political economy, or that less emphasis be given to its importance as a study in the high schools; but rather that emphasis be laid on vital topics, and that less time be devoted to controverted subjects and unsettled questions.’

“I fail to see how any teacher who treats any period of American history, going into the subject to the extent suggested in this memorandum can avoid the necessity of direct and formal teaching of political economy. The ‘connection’ spoken of in the resolution is so close that the conference could not avoid showing the direct value of economics in any better way than by publishing this memorandum.

“It was admitted by the members of the conference that the essential principles of economics were not above the reach of high school pupils; but that ‘an attempt to master the whole subject’ would result in the understanding of only a small part. Does any student in either high school or college ever master the whole of a subject? Coming from a body of men who are insisting upon the intensive study of history because it is admitted that the field is too large, such a statement is simply absurd. If there is anything made prominent in the good teaching of the day it is the acquirement of method, of a certain mental condition—a scientific attitude toward the material of knowledge. The objections to economics were multiplied by asserting the impossibility of securing trained teachers and the absence of proper text-books for high school use. The lack of good teachers is characteristic of history work, a fact which was ever present to the members of the conference; yet there is no reason to expect them to urge that history should be taught incidentally through English. Despite the feeling of the conference on this point, we have the fact that the majority of the university men who study history also take political economy, and as an increasing number of such men go into secondary schools there is no doubt that history will be better taught and that political economy will not suffer in its presentation. Every year sees an increasing number of good elementary works in economics

prepared by experienced teachers, and in that respect political economy is as well cared for as is history.

"The spirit exhibited by the conference was decidedly reactionary. The feeling exhibited toward economics is similar to the opposition shown a score of years ago to the introduction of natural science into the colleges and high schools. Science won, and to-day there is formal scientific teaching from the elementary school—under the name of 'natural study'—through the secondary school, up to the end of the college or university course. The same state of mind has manifested itself toward history. Until within the present decade history was regarded as an annex to literature and the idea that history teachers should be specialists was regarded as destructive of all that went to make sound 'culture.' In his inaugural address John Stuart Mill declared that university instruction in history was unnecessary, that the student should get his knowledge by private reading, and that a professor of history should devote his time to the work of interpretation. But we have changed all that. Every university and college has its department or course in history. High schools are endeavoring to make their work more adequate and more scientific, while our elementary schools are beginning to feel the influences which insist upon the great educational value of history taught by biographies, legends and incidents in national development. And instead of the literary and purely æsthetic view of history we all know that the revival of interest in history teaching has been characterized by a change of base—emphasis upon the economic and social changes and their influences in moulding the destiny of nations. In fact history taught without a knowledge of economics becomes characterless and invertebrate.

"In consideration of the question whether political economy and allied subjects should be placed in the high school course, it is very necessary that we should fix our attention on what the high school is supposed to be. We must realize that not more than ten per cent of the pupils of a high school go through it and go to college. What is our duty then toward those who do not expect to go beyond the high school? It seems to me that there is only one answer to that. We must come to realize that the public high school in America is a unique institution; it is there that the great majority of Americans receive all their formal education. In view of that fact it seems to me a very pressing problem to have a course of instruction in civics, politics—call it what you may—and some consideration of what we understand by economics, in every public high school. A course could be arranged that would make not too great a tax on either pupils or teachers.

"The committee of ten pointed out the fact that if instruction in political economy were given in the high school, it might be presented in such a way as to prove detrimental to independent thinking. But this is no more likely to occur with reference to instruction in political economy than in history. I think it would be well for one year in a high school course of four years to be given over entirely to instruction in politics and economics, or, at least, half a year. I know of schools where the interest of the pupils in these subjects has been so great that voluntary classes have been formed for such instruction. Such a course in such a school would, necessarily, be general; but the great point would be first of all to impress upon the minds of the pupils the idea of social growth, the idea that the society in which they live has had a history, has a definite organization, and that that organization can in a measure be studied. Society can be described; the capitalization of industry, the nature of property, the question of the relation of the state to industrial enterprises and to other forms of activity can be explained in such a way that the ordinary boy can get something out of it. There is no more necessity for a teacher of political economy in a secondary school to be dogmatic than for a teacher of history, or for a teacher of political economy in a college or university.

"The report of the committee of ten has had great weight in certain quarters, and as a whole deserves criticism. Whether or not we should have formal instruction in political economy in the high school is one of the most important questions before the American public. Certainly we cannot but realize that most of those who go through the public high school and what we call our private secondary school are getting no instruction whatever in this important science. It is not alone a matter of pedagogical necessity, but of practical expediency. Nothing can be said against political economy on the ground of the old bugbear of intellectual discipline. The great majority of the subjects taught in the ordinary high school seem to make no impression on the ordinary boy or girl. They come from the high school, as a rule drugged with mathematics and all their mental elasticity exhausted. The wail of the upper-class teacher soon is, 'What has become of the mathematical ability of these boys? It has collapsed.' The effect would be the same by a wrong use of political economy and politics along with history. No doubt mathematics would be the first thing to suffer, as in the high school Latin and Greek have been forced to give way to natural science.

"There is no pedagogical objection to putting political economy and politics into the secondary school. The conditions under which we live make it necessary for the public to see that this instruction is

given. The public is willing to pay for instruction in history and it is also willing to pay for like instruction in political science. It would be a social blunder if this were not the case. There is no reason to urge that political economy should not be required for entrance to college. It seems to me that as the number of those who go to college increases we shall be able to raise and dignify and enlarge the work in political economy in the high schools if it is a required subject for entrance to college. I feel that the interest being taken by the non-pedagogical element will put instruction in political economy to the front."

Professor Edmund J. James, of Chicago University, was the next speaker and in taking up the question of the Commercial High School spoke in part as follows:—

"In the first place I wish to say a word upon the point which Professor Stewart has brought up relating to the report of the committee of ten. I think that the report of this committee was one of the most reactionary documents that has ever been sent out. I am especially interested in this subject of the teaching of the social sciences not only in the universities, but in the high school and lower schools, and I feel that there is much just ground for criticism of this report. It seems to me a proper thing would be for the Academy and the American Economic Association to take up this question in a more earnest way than it has been taken up; both sides of the question ought to be heard. I am somewhat of a heretic on the attitude of the colleges and their feeling of leadership. As I read the educational history of the United States, it seems to me that the secondary schools hold a most important place. Our high schools have felt the need of getting themselves into harmony with the community which they represent. There have been incorporated into the curriculum of the high school the subjects which the people wanted to know and which they wanted their children to know, We find that instead of insisting upon Latin, Greek and mathematics, the high schools have been attempting in one decade after another new subjects. The college puts its stamp of approval upon certain subjects in the secondary schools and these are accepted for admission to college.

"I feel that one of the great educational problems is to force the study of civics, political economy, and this class of subjects to the very bottom of our schools. I should say that this is not only legitimate, but necessary. We shall never have an adequate education of our people unless we can extend and adapt the instruction in these subjects to our wants.



" Our present high school system, taking the country over, is defective. It consists in most places of a single institution similar to the Central High School in Philadelphia. Its course is based primarily upon a study of the humanities, language, literature, history, mathematics, elementary science. Its curriculum is intended primarily for those youth of the community who desire a general secondary education. As a matter of fact, however, its tendency and outlook is toward the college or the professions. This is proven by the fact that most of its graduates go to the college or enter one or another of the professional careers. It is also proven by the fact that the great majority of the youth who enter the manual callings, as well as those who enter business, do not think it worth their while to go to the typical high school at all.

" Now, there is a general feeling that this literary high school does not answer all the legitimate needs of the community for secondary education, and so manual training and high schools, similar to those now established in Philadelphia, the first city, by the way, to lead in this reform, are springing up throughout the country. These are not technical or professional schools, but they are educational institutions of secondary rank, intended to give a general and liberal training to those youth who, while desiring a secondary training, do not fancy the exclusively literary training of the typical high school.

" We now plead for the next step in the development of this system, the addition of a third school of secondary rank, the purely educational institution, not a technical nor a professional one, an institution which will give a liberal or general training like the other two schools, but a training which will appeal especially to that larger class of our youth who desire to enter business life and to whose tastes, as shown by the facts, the curricula of the present schools do not appeal. This class is as large as either of the others. It deserves consideration as much as they. We ought to afford these numbers also the opportunity of a secondary education which shall be a help and aid toward their future life-work. That many of them feel the need of such an opportunity is shown by the hundreds, and one may say thousands, of so-called commercial colleges which under unfavorable conditions are trying to serve this need of the community.

" Be it noted that we are not in favor of organizing out of public expenses schools like the present commercial colleges, but we are in favor of organizing schools with a purely liberal or general educational aim, but which, as an incident to other work, will serve the need indicated.

" The curriculum of such a school must be based upon a study of the social and political sciences. As every typical high school bases its

curriculum upon the humanities, as the manual training and high school bases its curriculum upon the natural sciences and mathematics, so this school must base its work on the study of politics and economics. It must, of course, include in its curriculum a modicum of the humanities, of the natural science, and of mathematics, just as the other two schools embrace in their curriculum a modicum of the social sciences. But the nucleus of this course of study will be found in the study of man in society, in the largest and most comprehensive way, exactly as the nucleus of the manual training school is to be found in the study of the sciences and their applications in the larger sense.

"These subjects offer as valuable material for a disciplinary and general training as either of the other subjects indicated. The study of commercial geography, of commercial history, of the organization and present constitution of industry, contains as valuable elements of an educational kind as are to be found in any other curriculum.

"It is almost impossible on an occasion like this to enter into details of a proposed curriculum, but aside from the modicum of language, which ought to be modern language and the languages of the pre-eminently commercial nations, and aside from the modicum of mathematics and natural science, which certainly ought to include a thorough course in chemistry, the following subjects might be mentioned as among those from which the material for such a curriculum can be selected.

"The elements of political economy on the one hand and political science and sociology on the other afford, so to speak, a theoretical basis for the entire curriculum. A study of the various forms of our government, local, state and national, a study of the commercial products to be found in the industry of the world to-day, their localization, their preparation, their relative importance, distribution, etc., a study of the banking and currency systems of the world, a study of the tariff systems of the world, the general mechanism of exchange, such as clearing houses, the subject of insurance in all its different aspects, the elements of constitutional and administrative law, the elements of commercial law, and other similar subjects, which might be mentioned, form a body of material out of which the matter suitable to secondary instruction can be easily obtained. There is no doubt that if such a commercial high school were established in any of our large cities, properly equipped and organized, its doors would be crowded with young men and women seeking the benefits of this kind of education."

The problem in the colleges was treated by Professor George C. Wilson, of Brown University. The following is an abstract of his paper:—

“In the discussion of the place of any subject in the scheme of education, there naturally arises the question of the purpose of the portion of the curriculum under consideration. In discussing the ‘Teaching of the Social Sciences in Colleges,’ the place of the college in the educational system should be first defined. This is a fundamental question and one still in a measure undecided. The preparatory schools have assumed the teaching of some of the subjects once included in the college course. The technical schools and universities now cover a portion of the old college course. The purpose of the preparatory school as related to the college is to fit the student for a broader education. The technical school aims to furnish courses which shall have practical utility. The university aims at the advancement of knowledge in the broad sense and at original investigation.

“Admitting that the college course, as it is called in America, is a desirable portion of our educational system, which seems to be more and more acknowledged at home and abroad, what should the aim of a college training be? The college holds a place between the preparatory school and the technical school or university. The field of the preparatory school is necessarily limited, that of the technical school or university necessarily specialized in a high degree. That the results of the specialized training of the highest technical institutions and that the result of the advanced research of the universities may become fruitful in well-being, indeed, that this work may continue to be valued, it must be supported by an intelligent public. There is left for the college the magnificent field of liberalizing education, of broadening culture and of training man to appreciate himself in his relations to the universe. That movement, naturally in England, but nevertheless unfortunately, christened ‘University Extension’ was in the best sense, from the American point of view, college extension. The American college idea, that of a training in broad and liberal culture, is gaining a place in the estimation of European educators and public men. This growing estimation must be exceedingly gratifying to those who have encouraged the enrichment of the college curriculum feeling that the technical school and university could thus reach the higher plane. For neither the technical school nor the university should be obliged to do the college work.

“The man who is to pass from college into active life needs a general training in the principles that are enunciated by the social

sciences, the technical specialist may need still more the broadening influence of such culture, the university specialist needs no less to apprehend man in his social relationships. Whatever may be the opinion as to the introduction of the social sciences at earlier stages in the educational system, there can be but one opinion upon the eminent appropriateness of these studies to the college curriculum.

"Admitting the propriety of social studies in the college course, the questions as to detail remain. The social sciences are distinct from each other though by no means separate. That which is obtained by the study of one contributes to an enlarged view of the data of some other of the social sciences. The ideal order of these sciences must vary somewhat with the method and aim of the training which different instructors have in mind. This arrangement will also be farther conditioned by period of time and circumstances under which the instruction is given. Ideal conditions do not exist, hence the question comes as to the best arrangement under existing conditions.

"The student entering college is confronted by new standards, generally a new environment both physical and social, and it is probably advisable not to make the transition in intellectual training a too severe mental shock. There are certain lines of social study which may be taken early with advantage. These seem to be quite generally accepted. The student has had such preparation as will make the study of the history of social, political and economic institutions natural and profitable, as well as preparatory to the social sciences. These studies may come early. The training in the so-called exact sciences prepares for accurate observation and description indispensable for the social sciences. Modern languages must be pursued as a means to the end of broader culture if for no other reason, even English seems to desire this attention. The classics furnish the atmosphere of an earlier and different civilization and contribute toward the college aim. As man is both a biological and psychological specimen as well as a sociological, the training that gives the view of man upon these sides of his nature supplements in an invaluable manner the socio-scientific training. Anthropology, ethnology, political geography, demography and kindred sciences are almost indispensable for a correct view of social relations. As many of these studies as possible should be placed in the first two years. Yet as at present governed, a college course cannot be arranged exclusively with reference to the ideal preparation for the social sciences proper. However, a good measure of historical preparation may be had in most colleges, a study of local and national institutions both political and social may be undertaken, and some measure of study of what is sometimes called descriptive sociology may be pursued to advantage

during the early half of the course. This preparation adds to the interest in, and makes more effective, the work in political economy and social science proper. The study of political and economic science may perhaps be introduced somewhat earlier than the other social sciences, not because of necessary logical precedence, but because the number and excellence of political and economic treatises makes possible the perspective necessary for the earlier stages of social study. The general study of statistics may probably accompany these studies beginning in the second or third year of the college course, though the study of the theory and science of statistics could be reserved even to the graduate work. The more specialized work needed in money, banking, etc., must come late or in the technical or university courses. The same may be said of finance, taxation and many of the problems of political administration. In general also theories and doctrines as such and social problems may be reserved till late in the course.

"Sociology in the narrow sense, because of the necessary previous preparation in biology, psychology, history, anthropology, etc., cannot be taken to best advantage before the third year of the college course. In some respects the narrower science might properly be a graduate study. The student of sociology needs some preparation in statistics and comparative institutions. He must know the bearing of the theory of evolution, and the theories of heredity upon modern science. He must have such high development of the mind and maturity of thought as to give him a sound basis for generalization. He must be able to distinguish condition and cause. Since sociology studies man from many points of view, the student must have had these view points. As the economist does not to-day disregard history, biology, psychology, so the sociological student must have a measure of training in the broadest possible field. Sociology, both from practical and pedagogical reasons, should be reserved till late in the college course. Many of the laws found to hold in sociology may have been earlier discovered as binding in other sciences. These laws may be none the less sociological laws, for priority of discovery does not here constitute exclusive right of possession. To apprehend these laws at their true value and sociological facts in their true relations requires the broadest possible preparation. Sociology in the narrow sense must, therefore, come late.

"If, then, the idea of a college training is broad humanizing culture, the social sciences, though they cannot claim to be all that is necessary for such a training, can properly claim a larger place than is given in many college curricula.

"The social sciences may look forward to an enlarged place in the

sphere of university research, may expect greater recognition in the technical school on account of their practical utility, and may be confident of growing recognition in that broad field of general culture which remains for the college."

Rev. Dr. Samuel W. Dike opened the general discussion which followed these three addresses. As secretary of the National Divorce Reform League, Dr. Dike has pleaded for years for greater attention and better instruction on social questions, in school and college. Moreover, he has been a pioneer in lecturing both before the general public and in the colleges of the country on these topics. He spoke, therefore, out of a large experience when he referred to some of the practical difficulties encountered. The following is a brief abstract of his remarks:—

"I shall speak upon this subject from a practical point of view. For about twenty years I have been interested in the family as a practical problem, beginning with the divorce question and studying the family in its connection with social science. At that time there was no instruction upon the family given in any of our colleges. The divorce question was first treated separately, then in connection with the family and the whole social question. To-day there has sprung up a great interest in the study of social questions. Many ministers write to me and ask how they shall go to work to study sociology; what books they shall read. Usually they have been reading general discussions of social subjects. The books they read treat of social questions, from the point of view of one or more of the social sciences, either separately or indiscriminately. The treatment is not distinctly sociological and therefore comparative. Though now able to call attention to the works of Giddings and others in sociology proper, the real want is not yet supplied, for they are in the higher realms of sociology. There is need for more elementary books on this subject; for a text-book that will be elementary and at the same time introductory to the science of sociology. I would like to see a small text-book that would do for the student of social science as a whole what an elementary book on political economy now does for that subject. One of the great needs is the cultivation of the social sense, for we must have a social sense before we have the social conscience. I would like a book that would set before me the different forms of society, such as the family, the village, the town or municipality, the school, the church, the corporation, etc. The students should be able to study

comparatively and analytically the principal features of the organization of these local institutions, and they should have such elementary knowledge of them as will enable them to see definitely what is needed for the improvement of local conditions. At the time of the election of mayor in New York, the people in Massachusetts were greatly interested in the problem of municipal government in that city. The religious press gave much space to this problem, and yet at no time was there a single hint of the recognition of any identity between the problems of New York City and their own local problems."

Professor GIDDINGS:—

"There is a part of this question of the teaching of sociology which has engaged my interest for some years, though until this present moment I have never ventured to speak upon it, and yet it is one concerning which that I have very often been questioned. It is this: Leaving out of consideration for the moment the utility of sociological studies; leaving out of consideration the question where they should be placed, whether in colleges, high schools, or elsewhere, we have also this question of interest to those who are especially interested in sociology: What studies are the necessary tools of the sociologist? Suppose a man desires to devote his life to the study of sociology; to the investigation of social questions, what particular studies must he master in order to have the tools to work with? In this attempt to make a place in the colleges and high schools for economic and social studies bad tactics have been adopted which I believe are a mistake, namely, the under-rating of the importance of the older studies of the college curriculum—mathematics, Latin and Greek.

"The studies which are to be followed out in the future in sociology may be divided into two groups. There will be a group of scholars interested in the development and formulation of sociological laws. I expect that all the sociological laws that we shall ever get will be formulated in terms of mathematical principles. We shall get the formulation of such laws as soon as we have collected and assorted the proper statistical material, because it will depend upon the intelligent use of statistical material.

"A great deal of very important scientific work will be done in this field in the near future, and it will be necessary to have men well trained in mathematics in order to do it. Mathematics is, therefore, an indispensable training to all advanced work to be done in the field of theoretical sociology. From a study of ethnology and anthropology we have brought together in recent years a large number of new ideas, new concepts, new terms. We have learned of the clan, of the tribe, of the federation of tribes. We have acquired the notion of kinship

in the family, and of the early forms of the family. These are important historical questions of sociology. Did the great modern European nations develop out of early forms of institutions of this kind, or did they not? These are historical questions to engage the sociologist, and they will have to be worked out in terms of the early history of the Germanic tribes, and the data for that study is to be found in old legal codes. As that data is all in Latin, it is absolutely useless to any student of sociology unless he has a reading knowledge of Latin.

"All the analyses in sociology, as the discussion of to-day and of all recent meetings of sociologists have shown, have to be made in terms of modern psychology. I say, therefore, that the three tools necessary for the man who desires to devote his life to the study of sociology, are: A good knowledge of mathematics, a reading knowledge of Latin and a good knowledge of psychology."

#### IV. GENERAL FEATURES AND RESULTS.

All of the sessions of the annual meeting were well attended, and a sufficient number of delegates from a distance were present to warrant the belief that the annual meeting furnishes opportunities to the members of the Academy which they appreciate and which cannot be supplied in any other way. The program was a full one, and still there was found some time for social intercourse and for visits on the part of strangers in the city to various places of interest. A meeting was arranged for at the Philadelphia Museums, where the Director, Dr. William P. Wilson, and the officers took considerable pains to explain the collection of products from all parts of the world and the methods by which the Information Bureau obtains and catalogues all available data on commerce and geography. Through the courtesy of the American Sugar Refining Company, an opportunity was afforded to visit the largest and best equipped sugar refinery in the country, the Spreckles Refinery on the Delaware. Visits to the Eastern Penitentiary and to other institutions of interest were privately arranged for at the request of some of the delegates.

An important meeting of the Council of the Academy



was held on Monday afternoon preceding the opening session, at which time the present work and administration and the future interests of the Academy were discussed. The delegates, members and their friends were entertained socially on the second evening of the meeting by the Provost and Mrs. Harrison, of the University of Pennsylvania.

To those specially interested in either the study or the teaching of sociology, the impressions received both from the body of material brought together and from the personal intercourse with those who had their thought focused on this one topic, were exceedingly helpful, and the results warrant us in the belief that it may be wise to pursue a similar policy and to select another general topic for the next annual meeting. In a field where there has been such great diversity of activity, and so little opportunity for personal contact between the workers, it is surprising that at this first meeting of the kind there should have been such general unanimity of opinion.

SAMUEL McCUNE LINDSAY.

*University of Pennsylvania.*